UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/678,883
Filing Date: October 03, 2003
Appellant(s): HALLER ET AL.

Ann Marie Mewherter
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/31/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 1/4/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 6,156,580	WOOTEN ET AL.	12-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-3, 8, 10-16, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wooten et al. (US 6,156,580).

In re **claim 1**, Wooten et al. teach a computer-implemented method (col. 1, lines 47-48), comprising using laser to **inspect** both front-side defects and back-side defects of a wafer (col. 1, lines 55-60) and col. 5, lines 48-51); and downloading the front-side and back-side inspection data to a microscope review station 110 (col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 3 and col. 2, lines 14-23) to **review** the front-side defects and the back-side defects to **determine** if these defects present certain **coordination** (col. 4, lines 14-17 and col. 8, lines 36-52) and thus to judge if the wafer is acceptable (col. 4, lines 17-19).

Although Wooten et al. do not expressly teach correlating a back-side defect with a front-side defect detected a specimen, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated review the front-side and back-side defects at certain coordinates (col. 4, lines 14-17) to determine a qualitative and/or quantitative **mutual relation** between the front-side defect and the back-side defect. This is because correlating the back-side defect with the front-side defect can be reasonably interpreted as finding a **mutual relation** between the front-side defects and the backside defects via reviewing the front-side and backside defects at a certain coordinate (col. 4, lines 14-17). Finding the mutual relation would involve determining if a portion of the backside defect has correlation with a portion of the front-side defect or if a portion of the backside defect matches a portion of the front-side defect.

In re **claim 2**, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have readily appreciate that by inspecting the front-side and back-side defects (col. 8, lines 36-52) it would be able to determine the **mutual relation** or correlation between the front-side defect and the back-side defect, because "inspecting" would include a determination of any relationship between the front-side defects and the back-side defects, such as an alignment between the front-side defect pattern and the back-side defect pattern.

In re **claim 3**, Wooten et al. teach generating a single visual representation of the specimen by transmitting the inspection defect data to the microscope review station 108 and 110 (Fig. 1) and to a control computer (col. 9, lines 6-7 and 13-14) to generate a visual representation for visual review (e.g. download inspection data to microscope station for visual review, col. 9, lines 21-22, 31-32 and col. 10, lines 56-57).

In re **claims 8 and 10**, Wooten et al. teach the claimed limitations because by **reviewing** the front-side defects and the back-side defects to **determine** if these defects present certain **coordination** (col. 4, lines 14-17 and col. 8, lines 36-52), one of the ordinary skilled in the art would be able to determine if a portion of the back-side defect is opposite to a portion of the front-side defect and to classify the defects, e.g. to see if the defect patterns are point-defect or line-defect or irregular shape defects via the microscope view station as taught by Wooten et al.

In e **claims 11 and 13**, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Wooten's teachings to classify the defects, as stated in the rejection against claims 8 and 10, and further to determine a root cause of the back-side defect (e.g. unwanted debris or contaminants) from data representing process history of the specimen while the microscope view station as taught by Wooten et al. obviously is capable of classifying and analyzing the defect data.

In re **claim 12,** one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Wooten's teachings to classify the defects, as stated in the rejection against claims 8 and 10, and to determine parameters for the classifying because analyzing and categorizing the defect pattern as taught by Wooten would include classifying the defects and determining parameters for the classifying.

In re claims 14 and 15, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Wooten's teachings to classify the back-side defect and to alter a parameter of a process tool in response to the classification or in response to the back-side defect to reduce occurrence of the front-side defect on additional specimen since Wooten teaches analyzing and categorizing the defect pattern and altering the parameter of a process tool, such as the position of wafer inverters 114 and 116 in the microscope review station 110. By analyzing and categorizing the defects and altering the positions of the wafer inverters it would lead to reduce occurrence of the front-side defect.

In re **claims 16 and 19**, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Wooten's teachings to correlate a back-side defect detected on a back-side of a specimen with a front-side defect detected on a front-side of the specimen, as stated in the rejection against claim 1, and thus to see if the back-side defect and the front-side defect satisfy one or more proximity criteria, because a criteria for selecting the wafer has certain characteristics in the specimen (col. 6, lines 25-29).

(10) Response to Argument

After reviewing the arguments in the Appeal Brief, it is quite clear that Appellant's assertion mainly is on the ground that the cited art does not provide a motivation to arrive the claimed invention and the Final rejection is based on impermissible hindsight. In other word, Appellant maintained that the cited art does not provide an explicit suggestion for a modification or for a reasonable expectation of success that would be able to properly establish *prima facie* obviousness.

To support the foregoing positions, Appellant provides the following ten points to rebut the motivations provided by the examiner in the Final rejection:

1) " **Wooten does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for correlating a backside defect with a frontside defect if a portion of the backside defect is determined to be opposite to a portion of the frontside defect.**" (Page 4)

2)" **Even if correlating a back side defect with a front side defect can be interpreted as finding a mutual relation between front side defects and back side defects, Wooten does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for finding such a mutual relation.** " (Page 10)

3) " **One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated by Wooten to attempt to find a mutual relation between front side defects and back side defects.**" (Page 10)

4) " **One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to perform the claimed correlating using the methods and systems taught by Wooten.**" (Page 12)

5) " **There is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for a reasonable expectation of success that the systems and methods of Wooten can be used as suggested by the Examiner.**" (Page 16)

6) " **Even if one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to modify the systems and methods taught by Wooten to meet the claimed invention, that fact alone is not sufficient to establish *prima facie* obviousness.**" (Page 17)

7) " **It would not have been obvious to try to modify the systems and methods of Wooten such that they can perform the claimed correlating step.**" (Page 18)

8) " **Even if the systems and methods taught by Wooten can be modified, that fact alone is not sufficient to establish *prima facie* obviousness.**" (Page 19)

9) " **Since the prior art is silent with regard to correlating frontside and backside defects, it appears that impermissible hindsight has been used to reject the present claims as obvious.**" (Page 20)

10) " **The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.**" (Page 21)

Regarding the foregoing ten points, all of Appellants' assertions are drawn to the major issue that Wooten's teachings do not teach, suggest or provide motivation for correlating a backside defect with a frontside defect if a portion of the backside defect is determined to be opposite to a portion of the frontside defect; or Wooten do not teach or suggest determining any relationship between frontside defects and backside defects. (see Appellants' arguments, second last paragraph on page **4**, first and last paragraphs on page **5**, second and third paragraphs on page **6**, entire page of page **7**, entire page of page **8**, second, third and fourth paragraphs on page **9**, entire page of page **10**, first and second paragraphs on page **11**, the second paragraph on page **12**, the entire page of page **13**, the entire page of page **15**, the entire page of page **16**, the entire page of page **17**, in the middle of page **20**, first and second paragraphs on page **21**, fourth paragraph on page **22**, third and fourth paragraphs on page **24**)

As stated above, the core Appellant's arguments are stated in page 4 through page 24 (i.e. total 21 pages). Seventeen pages out of 21 pages, Appellant repeatedly argued that Wooten et al. do not teach or **explicit suggest** any "correlating" step to determine any relationship between frontside defects and backside defects. Therefore, the Final rejection is based on impermissible hindsight (see the foregoing point 9); and one of the ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Wooten's teachings in any manner to determine any correlation between frontside defects and backside defects.

To draw the foregoing conclusions, Appellant maintained that Wooten teaches determining the coordinates of a front side defect on a front side of a wafer and the coordinates of a back side defect on a back side of a wafer (in the middle of page 5) and thus using the foregoing coordinates determined from laser scanning data to locate the defects in a defect review tool (last paragraph on **page 5** in the Appeal Brief); and then utilizing frontside and backside inspection data to position frontside defects and backside defects on the frontside and backside of the wafer, respectively. (second paragraph on **page 6**).

Therefore, Appellant concluded that even by locating defect positions on the front side and the backside of the wafer under the microscope, with the assistance of the coordinates obtained from laser scanning inspection which would provide accurate locations of defects on the wafer with respect to a certain reference point (i.e. similar to coordinates on a matrix in Mathematics), one of the ordinary skill in the art would still not be motivated or prompted to determine any correlation between the frontside defect and the backside defect and to see if the frontside defect position is opposite or aligned to the backside defect position; or to see if the frontside defect pattern (e.g. point defect or circular-shaped defect or line-shaped crack) is similar or dissimilar to the backside defect pattern.

In order to clarify the disagreement between Appellant's arguments and Examiner's position, it is worth to find out what the prior art's teachings really are and compare the differences between the claimed invention and prior art's teachings.

In the cited reference, Wooten et al. teach laser scanning frontside of the wafer (col. 8 line 22); transmitting the frontside scanning data to a control computer, wherein the frontside scanning data including wafer coordinates at which reflected laser light has a certain characteristic (col. 8, lines 23-26); inverting the wafer the backside to laser-scan the backside of the wafer (col. 8, lines 27-28); transmitting the backside scanning data to the control computer, wherein the backside scanning data including wafer **coordinates** at which reflected laser light has a certain characteristic (col. 8,lines 31-34); downloading the frontside scanning data and the backside scanning data to a microscope review station (col. 8, lines 41-42); **positioning** the wafer via the foregoing coordinates under the microscope **at the defect positions indicated by the coordinates** on the frontside and the backside of the wafer (col. 8, lines 43-45 and 50-52) for the **purpose** of viewing the **frontside defects and backside defects** (col. 6, lines 23-24). In addition, Wooten teaches that both frontside and backside defect review can be performed on the **same** microscope review station. (col. 5, lines 54-58).

The **major difference** between the claimed invention and Wooten's teachings is that Wooten does not explicit suggest " correlating the frontside defect with the backside defect if the portion of the backside defect is determined to be opposite to the portion of the frontside defect."

However, one of the ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, would have been **capable of modifying** the "base" technique as taught by Wooten in a predictable manner so that **any correlation** between the frontsdie defects and the backside defects located at the predetermined **coordinates** would be uncovered **because** Wooten teaches the "base" method that would sufficiently and effectively to provide frontside defect and backside **locations** in manageable manner, which is able to **reveal correlation or mutual relationship** between the frontside defect and the backside.

Regarding wafer coordinates, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have comprehended that the **coordinates** obtained from the laser scanning inspection in Wooten's teachings would provide **accurate defect locations** when viewing post-laser-scanning wafers in the microscope view station. It is obvious to the ordinary skill in the art that the forging coordinates acts as coordinates in matrix in Mathematics. For example, if there were a defect located at (4,4) on the frontside of the wafer and there were another similar defect located at (-4,4) on the backside of the wafer, then it indicated that the frontside defect is reflected over the y-axis with respect to the backside defect; or the frontsdie defect is aligned with the backside defect along an axis that is perpendicular to the wafer surface. With the provision of wafer **coordinates**, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been prompted to determine any mutual relationship (e.g. alignment or similar defect pattern or reflected image. etc..) between the frontside defects and the backside defects, which in turn would be **capable of** "correlating the backside defect with the frontside defect if the portion of the backside defect is determined to be opposite to the portion of the frontside defect", as recited in claim 1 or " correlating the backside defect with the frontside defect if the backside defect and the frontside defect satisfying the one or more proximity criteria", as recited in claim 16. Therefore, modifying Wooten's technique to determine the **correlation** between the frontside defects and the backside defects would have yield nothing more than **predictable results** to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

The obviousness analysis is not limited to the cited reference being applied, but includes the understanding of one of the ordinary skill in the art. The "mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the invention's nonobviousness." *Dann v. Johnson*, 425 U.S. 219, 230, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976). The Court has made clear that the teaching, suggestion or motivation test is flexible and an **explicit suggestion from the prior art is not necessary**. The motivation may be implicit and may be found in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or may be gleaned from the prior art as a whole. The gap between the prior art and the claimed invention may not be "so great as to render the [claim] nonobvious to one reasonably skill in the art." *Dann v. Johnson*, 425 U.S. 219, 230, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976). In this case, the gap between Wooten's teachings and the claimed invention is the "correlating" step. The gap, however, can be filled by modifying the "base" method as taught by Wooten, as stated previously.

In addition the major issue related to "correlating the backside defect with the backside defect...", as stated above, Appellant further argued the following issues, including:

(a) Appellant stated: "Wooten does not teach or suggest that inverting the wafer is or can be performed such that coordinates determined for locations opposite to each other on the front side and back side of the wafer are the same." (page 8, lines 6-8 in the Appeal Brief) Therefore, the coordinates in Wooten reference need to be altered in order to correlate defects on different sides of the wafer. (page 8, lines 23-26 in the Appeal Brief)

(Examiner's Response) Appellant's arguments is based on the assumption that the frontside coordinate is different from the backside coordinate because of wafer's inverting; and thus the frontside coordinate or the backside coordinate needs to be altered in order to correlate defects. The arguments, however, are not convincing because Wooten et al. do not teach or suggest the foregoing assumption. On the contrary, with the assistance of coordinate concept in matrix as in mathematics, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that by inverting the wafer the backside coordinate would be the reflection of the frontside coordinate. For example, a defect located at (4,4) on X-Y plane coordinate on the frontside will be at (-4,4) on X-Y plane coordinate on the backside. When there is a frontside defect located at (4,4) and there is a corresponding backside defect located at (-4,4), it means that the frontside defect is aligned with the backside defect along the axis passing through the point (4,4) in the coordinate and the axis is perpendicular to the wafer surface. Therefore, altering the coordinate is not necessary even inverting the wafer between inspecting the frontside and the backside of the wafer. In other word, by applying Wooten's method and system, one of the ordinary skill in the art would still be motivated to correlate the frontside defect and the backside defect.

(b) Appellant stated: "Wooten does not teach or suggest that the reflected images of the front side of the wafer and the back side of the wafer can be compared or that the same locations in the reflected images correspond to locations on the front side of the wafer and the back side of the wafer that are opposite to each other or correlate to one another." (page 14, lines 2-5) In other word, Appellant asserted that " one cannot simply display the reflected images of the back side and front side of the wafer or overlay the reflected images of the back side and front side of the wafer (neither of which Wooten teaches o suggests) to determine that circular-shaped black spots or black-spot defect patterns at the same positions in the reflected images of the front side and back side of the wafer are correlated." (page 14, lines 5-9)

(Examiner's Response) Appellant seems to misinterpret the purpose of obtaining reflected images from laser scanning inspection. Wooten made clear that reflected images from laser scan is for providing coordinates (col. 3, lines 57-61, col. 8, lines 22-26) (i.e. providing reference points for latter microscope viewing), not for "correlating" purpose or determining if the defect pattern are correlated. Following the laser scan step , the coordinates obtained from the laser scan step are transmitted to a control computer (col. 8, lines 30-34) and then downloaded the coordinate data to the microscope view station (col. 8, lines 41-42 and 48-49) to position the wafer via the coordinates (col. 8, lines 43 and 50) and thus to view the frontside and backside defects (col. 6, lines 21-24). Therefore, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have comprehended that "correlating" defects are to be performed in the microscope view station based on microscopic images, not based on the reflected images from laser scan inspection, as asserted by the Appellant.

(c) Appellant stated: "The system and methods of Wooten are **inherently** incapable of performing the claimed correlating step." (page 18, the third paragraph; Emphasis added) Thus, "there is no reasonable expectation of success of how or if the systems and methods of Wooten can be modified such that they can perform or be used to perform the claimed correlating step." (page 18, the third paragraph)

(Examiner's Response) Without providing factual evidence or convincing reasons, Appellant concluded that Wooten's method and system "are **inherently** incapable of performing the claimed correlating step." (Emphasis added) In this regard, even Wooten et al. do not explicitly identify potential solution for doing so, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have prompted to vary the prior art in a predictable manner to perform the "correlating" step, as stated previously. Again, the suggestion or motivation test is flexible and an explicit suggestion from the prior art is not necessary. The suggestion or motivation may be implicit in view of the prior art applied and may be found in the nature of the problem, or in the knowledge of a person having ordinary skill in the art, not just explicit indication in the prior art. In this case, the Examiner has provided detailed explanation, as stated previously, to support the examiner's conclusion of obviousness.

(d) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for generating a single visual representation of a specimen that illustrates a backside defect and a frontside defect with different formatting to visually differentiate the backside defect and the frontside defect." (Page 22, second last paragraph)

(Examiner's Response) The Examiner disagrees with Appellant's arguments. Wooten et al. teach transmitting the laser-scan inspection data to a control computer (col. 9, lines 6-7 and 13-14), downloading the inspection data from the control computer to the microscope review station 108 and 110 (Fig. 1) to generate a visual representation of a specimen (i.e. the wafer having defects thereon) for visual review (col. 9, lines 21-22, 31-32 and col. 10, lines 56-57). The visual representation refers to any microscopic images and/or microstructures comprising frontside and backside defects obtained from the microscope view station, which would provide information for visually differentiating the backside defect and the frontside defect.

(e) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for determining if a portion of a backside defect detected on a backside of a specimen is opposite to a portion of a frontside defect detected on a frontside of the specimen by comparing coordinates defining a location of the backside defect with coordinates defining a location of the frontside defect." (The third paragraph on page 24)

(Examiner's Response) As stated previously, with the provision of wafer coordinates, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to determine any correlation between the frontside defects and the backside defects from microscopic photos obtained from the microscope view station, which in turn would be **capable of** " determining if a portion of a backside defect detected on a backside of a specimen is opposite to a portion of a frontside defect detected on a frontside of the specimen by comparing coordinates defining a location of the backside defect with coordinates defining a location of the frontside defect."

(f) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach or suggest classifying backside defects." (The second paragraph on page 26)

(Examiner's Response) Wooten et al. teach the claimed limitations because by reviewing the frontside defects and the backside defects to determine if these defects present certain coordination (col. 4, lines 14-17 and col. 8, lines 36-52), one of the ordinary skilled in the art would be able to determine if a portion of the back-side defect is opposite to a portion of the front-side defect; and to classify the defects, e.g. to classify what kind of the defect pattern or to classify if the wafer having defect is acceptable or not via the microscope view station (see Wooten, col. 4, lines 28-30). After all, the claimed limitation does not clearly set forth any detailed step as to how to classify the backside defect. Therefore, the limitation can be broadly and reasonably interpreted as "assorting or grouping the backside defect based on a certain criteria." In this case, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize any microscopic data obtained from the microscope view station, which reveals microstructures comprising the defect, to assort or group the defect, such as sorting wafers having point defect as class A and sorting wafers having line-crack defect as class B, etc....

(g) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach or suggest classifying a backside defect and determining a root cause of the backside defect from data representing processing history of a specimen." (The first paragraph on page 28)

(Examiner's Response) In this regard, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Wooten's teachings to classify the defects, as stated previously, and further to determine a root cause of the back-side defect (e.g. unwanted debris or contaminants) from data representing process history of the specimen because the laser scan inspection tool along with the microscope view station as taught by Wooten et al. are capable of classifying and analyzing the defect data and providing information for determining the root cause of the defect.

(h) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach or suggest classifying a backside defect and determining parameters for classifying a frontside defect from the classification of the backside defect." (Fourth paragraph on page 29)

(Examiner's Response) In this regard, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the microscopic viewing data as taught by Wooten to determine parameters for the classifying. For example, setting the defect numbers within the entire wafer surface not more than 3 % of the entire wafer surface area as a acceptance parameter to classify if the wafer is acceptable or not since Wooten et al. teach utilizing the method and system for acceptance test (col. 4, lines 28-30).

(i) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach or suggest classifying a backside defect and determining a root cause of a frontside defect from the classification of the backside defect." (Fourth paragraph on page 31)

(Examiner's Response) As stated in point (g), the laser scan inspection tool along with the microscope view station as taught by Wooten et al. are capable of classifying and analyzing the defect data and providing information for determining the root cause of the defect. In addition, by applying Wooten's teachings one of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to correlate if the frontside defect is opposite to the backside defect, as stated previously. If the correlating step determines that the frontside defect is opposite to the backside defect or the frontside defect is aligned with the backside defect, then one person in the ordinary skill would be able to determine if the root cause of the frontside defect is related to the backside defect, which may be contributed from processing-related mistakes, based on the classification of the backside defect.

(j) Appellant stated: "The cited art does not teach or suggest classifying a backside defect and altering a parameter of a process tool in response to the classification" (fourth paragraph on page 33); and "The cited art does not teach or suggest altering a parameter of a process tool in response to a backside defect to reduce occurrence of a frontside defect on additional specimen processed in the process tool." (Third paragraph on page 35)

(Examiners' Response) One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Wooten's teachings to classify the back-side defect and to alter a parameter of a process tool in response to the classification or in response to the back-side defect to reduce occurrence of the front-side defect on additional specimen, since by applying Wooten's method and system, one person in the ordinary skill would be able to analyze and categorize the defect pattern and alter the parameter of a process tool, such as altering operating parameter of the microscope view station. By analyzing and categorizing the defects and altering the parameter, it would lead to reduce occurrence of the front-side defect or increase acceptance rate since Wooten teaches utilizing the method and system to perform acceptance test (col. 4, lines 28-30).

Conclusions:

Wooten explicit teaches detecting backside defects on a backside of a specimen (i.e. the wafer) and frontside defects on a backside of the specimen. One of the ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, would have been motivated to apply the "base" technique as taught by Wooten to perform “correlating” step based on the microscopic data associated with coordinates obtained from laser scan inspection, although Wooten does not explicitly provide the suggestion and motivation.

However, the teaching, suggestion or motivation test is flexible and an explicit suggestion from the prior art is not necessary. The motivation may be implicit and may be found in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or may be gleaned from the prior art as a whole. In other word, the obviousness analysis is not limited to the cited reference being applied, but includes the understanding of one of the ordinary skill in the art. The "mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the invention's nonobviousness." *Dann v. Johnson*, 425 U.S. 219, 230, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976). The gap between the prior art and the claimed invention may not be "so great as to render the [claim] nonobvious to one reasonably skill in the art." *Dann v. Johnson*, 425 U.S. 219, 230, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976). The examiner has provided detailed explanation as to why it would be obvious to the ordinary skill in the art to fill the gap. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been properly established.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Respectfully submitted

Hsien Ming Lee

Art Unit 2823

Conferees

TQAS
Dunn Drew, SPE, ~~Art Unit 2817~~

Matthew Smith, SPE, Art unit 2823

MATTHEW SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Hsien Ming Lee, Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2823